

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| PPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | | |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| 09/833,026 | 04/10/2001 | TIKST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION N |
| | | Gary Helms | 108298613US | 8349 |
| 25096 75 | 90 11/30/2004 | | | |
| PERKINS CO. | ELLP | | EXAMI | INER |
| PATENT-SEA | | | WEBB, JAMISUE A | |
| P.O. BOX 1247 | | | | |
| SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| • | | | 3629 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|--|---|----------------|
| 0.55 | 09/833,026 | 1 | α |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | HELMS ET AL. | ブ ^リ |
| The MAIL INC. | 1 | Art Unit | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app | pears on the cover sheet with th | 10 COFFESDON dence addre | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 AL | Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30), will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr cause the application to become ABANDO g date of this communication, even if timely f action is non-final. action is non-final. Ince except for formal matters, p x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4 | FH(S) FROM e timely filed days will be considered timely, om the mailing date of this commu- NED (35 U.S.C. § 133), filed, may reduce any | unication. |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or a Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | oted or b) objected to by the lawing(s) be held in abeyance. See | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). | 21(d). 2. |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign pri a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | -(d) or (f). | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents had 2. Certified copies of the priority documents had 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau (P* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies. | ave been received in Application documents have been received to the 13 Oct. | d in this National Stage | |
| Attachment(s) | , | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary (F Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Pat 6) Other: | 9 | |
| S. Patent and Trademark Office TOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office Action | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/833,026

Art Unit: 3629

ţ

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to amendment filed 8/6/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 4. Claims 1-3, 9, 12, 17-19, 22-24, 28-30, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kipp (5,890,136) in view of Horwitz et al. (6,496,806).
- 5. With respect to Claims 1, 11, 22 and 32: Kipp discloses the use of an order database (26) that is used to pull inventory and for shipping (See abstract), where the orders are tracked (Column 2, lines 34-37) through an order database (Column 7, lines 16-18) and tracks the

articles (Column 5, lines 47-64). However, Kipp fails to disclose the use of a unit order

Art Unit: 3629

database that includes a record for each unit of each item of the order. Horwitz discloses the use of a method and system for tracking each individual item of a cluster of items (See abstract) that can be used for purchase order systems (Column 1, lines 17-63), where a record of each item is stored in a database, and each record is linked through a cluster, so that when the status of one item changes, the cluster changes (see Column 4, lines 40-57, Column 1, lines 1-20, and Column 8, lines 17-24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kipp, to include the method and system of tracking each individual item of a cluster, as disclosed by Horwitz, in order to more accurately track items that are moved, handled or processed in clusters. (See Horwitz, Column 1)

- 6. With respect to Claims 2, 12, 23 and 33: See Horwitz, Column 6, lines 9-19.
- 7. With respect to Claims 3, 13, 24 and 34: See Horwitz, Column 6, lines 28-50.
- 8. With respect to Claims 7, 17 and 28: Horwtiz discloses the updating of the database that contains the items happens when the items are moved from one storage location to another storage location (See Column 11, line 41 to Column 12, line 64). The examiner considers this to be a periodic basis, since the pallets are not moved on a continuous basis, but sit in storage and inventory.
- 9. With respect to Claims 8, 18 and 29: The items in Horwitz are tracked on a real time basis (column 12, lines 65), therefore multiple times a day, which the examiner considers to be done on a daily basis.
- 10. With respect to Claims 9, 19 and 30: See Column 12, lines 1-67.

Art Unit: 3629

- 11. Claims 4-6, 10, 13-16, 21, 25-27, 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kipp and Horwitz et al. as applied to claims 1, 11, 22 and 32 above, and further in view of Peachey-Kountz et al. (6,463,345).
- 12. With respect to Claims 4-6, 10, 13-16, 21, 25-27, 31 and 35: Kipp and Horwitz discloses the use of a purchase order and having a record for each item in an order that is shipped, but fail to disclose the order can be modified to increase or decrease the quantity of the order, and either adding a unit record or setting a record to cancelled. Peachey-Kountz discloses the use of orders where the quantity of items are changed and modified due to backorders or cancellation of orders (see Figures 5-7, Column 11, lines 53-67), and the record status is updated to reflect the change, (see Figures 5 and 6 with corresponding detailed description). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kipp and Horwitz, to include the capability of changing the order, and the records reflecting the change, in order to provide an improved reporting system. (See Peachey-Kountz, Column 9)

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamisue A. Webb whose telephone number is (703) 308-8579.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 - 4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jamesue Delebb

JOHN G. WEISS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600